

Remarks

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject patent application are respectfully requested.

Amendments of a formal nature have been made to claims 1 and 7. These amendments were not necessitated by any rejection nor are these amendments made for reasons relating to patentability.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 12 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being "obvious" over Sawaguchi (U.S. Patent No. 5,961,386) in view of Millman *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,619,635). Applicants traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a system for providing video game specification data, comprising a display and a control circuit for causing the display to display an interactive form containing data entry fields for inputting game specification data that specifies characteristics of a video game developed for a particular game platform. As described in the present specification connection with the illustrative embodiments, such a system, among other things, facilitates the submission of games to game machine companies or others that test the games.

The office action alleges that Sawaguchi discloses a system for providing video game specification data and references lines 1-5 of the abstract in this regard. *See* 7/6/04 Office Action, page 2. However, the Abstract describes storing specific characteristic data of each game player (not game) on a memory card: "...the computer game is a competing type game and specific characteristic data of each of game players is stored in a memory card of each game player" (emphasis added). *See also* Sawaguchi, col. 4, lines 37-39 ("At the step 402, personal data (specific characteristic data) of each game players (sic) is loaded from a memory card of the game player."); col. 4, lines 50-52 ("At the step 409, new (updated) personal data of each game player is saved into the memory card of each game player."); and col. 6, lines 14-20 ("at least two machine-readable medium each containing at least a first data and a separate second data ..., said first data corresponding to a respective player's ability to play the computer game, and the separate second data corresponding to previous accomplishment of said respective player in playing the computer game..."). As such, Applicant disagrees with the contentions regarding Sawaguchi in the office action and respectfully submits that there is no disclosure therein of the concept of game specification data that specifies characteristics of a video game developed for a

particular game platform or of displaying a form having data input fields for inputting such game specification data.

The office action acknowledges the deficiencies of Sawaguchi with respect to the displaying of a form as specified in claim 1. Millman *et al.* is alleged to remedy this deficiency. Millman *et al.* describes an environment for creating and modifying complex forms. While it is not completely clear from the description of Millman *et al.* whether the “form constraint information” referenced on page 3 of the office action is input via data input fields, Applicant notes that Millman *et al.*, like Sawaguchi does not disclose the claimed game specification data. Thus, even the forced combination of Millman *et al.* and Sawaguchi as proposed would not result in the subject matter of claim 1.

Independent claim 7 is directed to a method for providing video game specification data comprising displaying on a display an interactive form containing data entry fields for inputting game specification data that specifies characteristics of a video game developed for a particular game platform; entering game specification data into the data entry fields; and validating the data entered into the data entry fields. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, neither Sawaguchi nor Millman *et al.* disclose the claimed game specification data and thus the combination of these references is likewise deficient in this regard. Consequently, claim 7 is believed to be allowable over the proposed combination of Sawaguchi and Millman *et al.*

Independent claim 12 is directed to a game submission system comprising communication circuitry for receiving video games and video game specification data submitted thereto over a communications network, a memory for storing routing information, and processing circuitry for routing data regarding submitted video games and video game specification data in accordance with the routing data. Neither Sawaguchi nor Millman *et al.* discloses or suggests a game submission system and, as noted above, neither of these documents discloses the concept of game specification data as claimed. Consequently, claim 12 is believed to be allowable over the proposed combination of Sawaguchi and Millman *et al.*

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and claim 16 depends from claim 12. These claims are believed to be allowable at least by virtue of these dependencies.

Claims 3 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being “obvious” over the proposed Sawaguchi-Millman *et al.* combination, in further view of Brown (U.S. Patent No. 6,671,768). Brown is applied in connection with claims 3 and 8 for its

purported disclosure of CRCs. However, Brown does not remedy the above-noted deficiencies of Sawaguchi and Millman *et al.* in connection with claims 1 and 7, from which claims 3 and 8 depend, respectively. As such, the proposed combination of Sawaguchi, Millman *et al.* and Brown, even if proper, would not result in the subject matter of claims 3 and 8.

Claims 4-6 and 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being “obvious” over a proposed combination of Sawaguchi, Millman *et al.*, and Brown, in further view of Shaklee (U.S. Patent No. 5,841,952). Shaklee is applied for its alleged disclosure of “separate images.” Applicants respectfully submit that Shaklee’s disclosure of images on different CRTs is wholly unrelated to the subject matter of ROM images in the context of claims 4-6 and 9-11. In any event, Shaklee does not remedy the deficiencies of Sawaguchi, Millman *et al.* and/or Brown in connection with claims 1 and 7 and thus the proposed combination of Shaklee with these references would not have rendered obvious the subject matter of claims 4-6 (which depend from claim 1) and claims 9-11 (which depend from claim 7).

Claims 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being “obvious” over the proposed combination of Sawaguchi and Millman *et al.*, in further view of Crump *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,791,992). Crump *et al.* is applied for its alleged disclosure of playing games on the Internet and of “status” bits. Crump *et al.* does not remedy the deficiencies of Sawaguchi and Millman *et al.* with respect to claim 12 and thus the combination of these references with Crump *et al.* would not result in the subject matter of claims 13 and 14 which depend from claim 12. In addition, the disclosure of status bits indicating the state of data latches as disclosed in Crump *et al.* is in no way suggestive of the status data for submitted video games described in claim 14.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being “obvious” over the proposed combination of Sawaguchi and Millman *et al.*, in further view of Kohari *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,291,405). Kohari *et al.* is applied to claim 15 for its purported disclosure of notification information to personnel regarding changes to a document. First, Kohari *et al.* does not remedy the deficiencies of Sawaguchi *et al.* and Millman with respect to claim 12, from which claim 15 depends. Second, the disclosure of notification information regarding document changes would not have suggested the claimed notification of receipt of submitted video game and video game specification data. For these reasons, claim 15 is not rendered obvious by the proposed combination of Sawaguchi *et al.*, Millman and Kohari *et al.*

New claims 17-23 have been added. The subject matter of these new claims is fully supported by the original disclosure and no new matter is added.

Claim 17 is directed to a server for a video game submission system that is remotely accessible by video game program developers. The server comprises a processing system and a game submission application executed by the processing system for generating one or more display screens usable by video game program developers that remotely access the video game submission system server to enter video game program specification data specifying characteristics for one or more video game programs and for generating one or more display screens providing status information regarding video game programs previously submitted to the video game submission system. Applicant respectfully submits that the applied documents do not show or suggest such a server. Consequently, claim 17 is believed to be allowable.

Claim 18 is directed to a computer readable medium storing instructions executable by a processing system to control a video game submission system server to generate one or more interactive forms that are remotely accessible via a communication network, the interactive forms comprising data fields for inputting characteristics of a video game program; receive via the communication network the video game program characteristics input to the interactive forms along with a corresponding video game program; and automatically route the received video game program characteristics and video game program in accordance with a routing list to one or more video game reviewers. Applicant respectfully submits that the applied documents do not show or suggest such a computer readable medium. Consequently, claim 18 and its dependent claims 19-23 are believed to be allowable.

Kai ZEH


Application No. 09/842,323

Response to Office Action dated July 6, 2004

The pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance and favorable office action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: 
Michael J. Shea
Reg. No. 34,725

MJS:dbp

1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor

Arlington, VA 22201-4714

Telephone: (703) 816-4000

Facsimile: (703) 816-4100